

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 236

CE 080 830

AUTHOR Nilsen, Sigurd R.
TITLE Multiple Employment and Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Indicate Need for Closer Examination of Structure. Report to the Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives.
INSTITUTION General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.
REPORT NO GAO-01-71
PUB DATE 2000-10-13
NOTE 61p.
AVAILABLE FROM U.S. General Accounting Office, P.O. Box 37050, Washington, DC 20013. Tel: 202-512-6000; Fax: 202-512-6061; TDD: 202-512-2537; Web site: <http://www.gao.gov> (first copy free; additional copies \$2.00 each; 100 or more: 25% discount). For full text: <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d0171.pdf>.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Cost Effectiveness; *Employment Programs; *Federal Programs; *Job Training; Labor Force Development; Outcomes of Education; Postsecondary Education; Program Budgeting; Program Costs; Program Design; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Program Improvement

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of federally funded work force development programs, such as employment and training programs. Information, including budget data for fiscal years 1999 and 2000, was gathered on federally funded employment and training programs for which a key program goal is providing assistance to persons trying to find employment or improve their job skills. Information on the groups of individuals these programs target, the services each program provides, and possible areas of overlap was also obtained. In addition, researchers sought the type of information needed to assess whether these programs are duplicative and inefficient and raised issues to be considered in developing options to improve the efficiency of federally funded employment and training programs. The study identified 40 federally funded employment and training programs for which a key program goal is providing assistance to persons trying to find employment or improve their job skills. The 35 programs that provided data on how funds were used indicated that \$11.7 billion funded work force development activities and that 6 of these programs accounted for nearly two-thirds of the \$11.7 billion. Thirty-three of the 40 employment and training programs served primarily a single target group, and most of them offered participants a wide range of employment and training services. Programs overlap when multiple agencies administer programs that are designed to achieve similar outcomes, creating the potential for administrative inefficiencies and duplication of, or gaps in, service delivery. The study recommended more coordination and cooperation among programs to eliminate duplication of efforts. (The report includes information on each of the programs and comments about the report from the departments of Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Labor, and Veterans Affairs.) (KC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

GAO

United States General Accounting Office

Report to the Chairman, Committee on
the Budget, House of Representatives

October 2000

ED 446 236

MULTIPLE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Overlapping Programs Indicate Need for Closer Examination of Structure



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.



GAO

Accountability • Integrity • Reliability

GAO-01-71

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

Letter	3
--------	---

Appendixes	
Appendix I: Estimated Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations Used for Employment and Training Services	30
Appendix II: Services and Activities of Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs That Identified Primary Target Groups	32
Appendix III: Program Objectives and Eligibility Criteria for Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs	34
Appendix IV: Comments From the Department of Education	41
Appendix V: Comments From the Department of Health and Human Services	45
Appendix VI: Comments From the Department of Housing and Urban Development	49
Appendix VII: Comments From the Department of the Interior	50
Appendix VIII: Comments From the Department of Labor	51
Appendix IX: Comments From the Department of Veterans Affairs	56
Appendix X: GAO Contacts and Staff Acknowledgments	57

Tables	
Table 1: Estimated Proportion of Fiscal Year 1999 Budget Appropriation Used on Employment and Training Services and Activities	10
Table 2: Estimated Number of Program Participants Who Received Employment and Training Services, Fiscal Year 1999	14
Table 3: Programs That Required That Their Participants Be Economically Disadvantaged in Order to Be Eligible for Services	19
Table 4: Services That Programs Serving Native Americans Provided, Fiscal Year 1999	21
Table 5: Services That Programs Serving Youths Provided, Fiscal Year 1999	22
Table 6: Services That Programs Serving Veterans Provided, Fiscal Year 1999	22

Figures

Figure 1: Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs by Agency, Fiscal Year 1999	9
Figure 2: The Six Programs That Accounted for Nearly Two-Thirds of Funding Used for Employment and Training Services and Activities, Fiscal Year 1999	12
Figure 3: Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs by Target Group, Fiscal Year 1999	16
Figure 4: The Services and Activities of 33 Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs That Identified a Primary Target Population	18

Abbreviations

HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
VA	Department of Veterans Affairs
WIA	Workforce Investment Act



United States General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

October 13, 2000

The Honorable John R. Kasich
Chairman, Committee on the Budget
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

A strong competitive workforce is necessary to succeed in today's era of technological advances and increased global competition. For more than 50 years, the federal government has invested considerable effort and resources to help people find productive employment by administering an array of employment and training programs. The Congress is interested in ensuring that these programs foster a coherent and efficient approach to helping individuals find jobs in an environment characterized by changing labor demands. In the 1990s, we issued a series of reports that raised issues regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of the federally funded employment training system and concluded that a structural overhaul and consolidation of these programs was needed. In 1998, in response to concerns regarding the fragmented employment and training system, the Congress passed the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). One of WIA's primary features provides for closer coordination of employment and training services by requiring a centralized service delivery system for many federal programs by establishing one-stop-centers, yet WIA consolidated only a few employment and training programs.

Because of your interest in increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of federally funded workforce development assistance, you asked us to provide information on such employment and training programs. This report provides information on (1) federally funded employment and training programs for which a key program goal is providing assistance to persons trying to find employment or improve their job skills, including data on each program's federal budget appropriation for fiscal years 1999 and 2000 and the proportion of the appropriation used for employment and training services and activities; (2) the groups of individuals these programs are targeting, the services each program provides, and possible areas of overlap; and (3) the type of information needed to assess whether these programs are duplicative and inefficient and issues to be considered in developing options to improve the overall efficiency of federally funded employment and training programs.

To address your request, we analyzed the June and December 1999 Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance to identify programs that directly fund or support employment and training services and activities and that have as a key program goal providing assistance to persons who are trying to find employment or improve their job skills. We also sent a questionnaire to employment and training program officials at seven federal agencies, and we obtained information on the proportion of fiscal year 1999 and 2000 federal appropriations used specifically for employment and training services and activities, target populations served, the number of persons receiving services from each program, and the specific services each program provides.

In contrast to our past reports, this report focuses on programs in which employment and training services and activities—also known as workforce development activities—are a key program component.¹ We did not include loan or grant programs such as the Federal Pell Grant Program. While such programs provide some funding for students in vocational schools, their primary goal is providing financial assistance to students in postsecondary institutions such as colleges and universities.² We also did not include programs, such as those supporting economic and community development projects or small business enterprises, that may provide some workforce development activities but that do not focus on employment and training as a key program goal. We conducted our work from December 1999 to October 2000 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Results in Brief

We identified 40 federally funded employment and training programs for which a key program goal is providing assistance to persons trying to find employment or improve their job skills. Seven federal agencies and

¹See, for example, *Multiple Employment Training Programs: Major Overhaul Needed to Reduce Costs, Streamline the Bureaucracy, and Improve Results* (GAO/T-HEHS-95-53, Jan. 10, 1995) and *Multiple Employment Training Programs: Conflicting Requirements Underscore Need for Change* (GAO/T-HEHS-94-120, Mar. 10, 1994).

²In addition to Pell Grants, we identified five other major loan and grant programs that the Department of Education administers. While the primary goal of these programs is to help individuals attain a postsecondary education, they also provide funding for individuals attending vocational schools. In 1999, the Congress appropriated \$39 billion for these programs, of which 19 percent was spent on financial assistance to students attending vocational institutions. Education defines vocational institutions as 2-year public, 2-year private, and for-profit trade schools.

departments administer these programs, although the departments of Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services (HHS) are responsible for most of them. The 35 programs that provided us with data on how funds were used indicated that \$11.7 billion funded workforce development activities and that 6 of these programs accounted for nearly two-thirds of the \$11.7 billion. The number of participants the programs served ranged from one program that served only 318 persons to another that served 12 million.

Thirty-three of the 40 employment and training programs served primarily a single target group in fiscal year 1999. The most frequently cited target populations were Native Americans (10 programs), youths (5 programs), and veterans (5 programs). Twelve of these programs also required that their participants be economically disadvantaged in order to receive services. Most of the 33 programs offered their participants a wide range of employment and training services. While many of these targeted programs overlap by serving the same general target group and providing similar services, some participants may be eligible for one program but not another because program eligibility criteria differ. For example, one of the Native American programs serves only disabled Native Americans while another serves only Native Hawaiians.

Programs overlap when multiple agencies administer programs that are designed to achieve similar outcomes. Such overlap creates the potential for duplication of, or gaps in, service delivery, as well as administrative inefficiencies. While program overlap is sometimes necessary to meet federal priorities, it can create an environment in which programs do not serve participants as efficiently and effectively as possible. To determine whether duplication and inefficiencies result from overlap among employment and training programs, one would have to obtain and analyze a considerable amount of additional information beyond that in our review, such as participant eligibility requirements, whether programs are providing similar services to similar groups of individuals, information on program effectiveness, and the relative costs and benefits of different service delivery mechanisms. In addition, because effective coordination among programs can reduce the likelihood of duplication and inefficiency, information on the degree of coordination among programs with similar objectives is also needed. To address the potential consequences of program overlap, policymakers could choose to look more closely at programs that serve similar target populations and provide similar services and, where appropriate, choose to integrate or consolidate programs or establish mechanisms to ensure program coordination. WIA plays a role in

coordinating service delivery of federally funded employment and training programs by requiring that more than a dozen federal programs make certain services available through the one-stop centers.

On an administrative level, agencies' annual performance plans, submitted under the Government Performance and Results Act, provide agencies an opportunity to describe their activities to coordinate their employment and training programs. While Labor, Education, and HHS generally discuss in their performance plans ongoing or planned efforts to coordinate with other federal agencies, the plans discuss to a limited degree specific coordination efforts pertaining to employment and training programs. In addition, information derived from evaluation and analysis conducted by agencies, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), or others could identify opportunities for greater coordination and the degree of program inefficiencies as well as methods for addressing these areas. OMB could also use the governmentwide performance plan, based on agencies' annual performance plans, to more directly address crosscutting programs.

Background

During the 1990s, we issued a series of reports that documented mission fragmentation and program overlap among federally funded employment and training programs and identified possible areas of resulting inefficiencies.³ In 1994, we reported that overlap among federally funded employment and training programs raised questions concerning the efficient and effective use of resources.⁴ In 1995, we reported that program overlap might hinder persons seeking assistance and frustrate employers and program administrators.⁵ Both fragmentation and overlap occur when more than one federal agency (or more than one bureau within an agency) is involved in the same broad area of national service need. Program overlap creates the potential for duplication, which occurs when programs have the same eligibility criteria, provide similar services in the same

³See, for example, *Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Can Add Unnecessary Administrative Costs* (GAO/HEHS-94-80, Jan. 28, 1994), *Managing for Results: Using the Results Act to Address Mission Fragmentation and Program Overlap* (GAO/AIMD-97-146, Aug. 29, 1997), and GAO/T-HEHS-95-53.

⁴*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlap Among Programs Raises Questions About Efficiency* (GAO/HEHS-94-193, July 11, 1994).

⁵*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Major Overhaul Needed to Create a More Efficient, Customer-Driven System* (GAO/T-HEHS-95-70, Feb. 6, 1995).

location, have similar service delivery mechanisms, and provide the same activities or strategies to achieve their program goals.

In 1998, the Congress passed WIA in response to concerns about the inefficiencies in the federal workforce development effort. WIA repealed the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), effective July 1, 2000, and replaced JTPA programs for economically disadvantaged adults and youths, and dislocated workers with three new programs—Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth.⁶ Under WIA, the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program was eliminated as a separately funded program, but local areas are required to offer summer employment opportunities as part of the youth program. Separate funding streams remain for adult and dislocated worker activities.

In an effort to coordinate service delivery for employment and training programs, WIA established one-stop centers in all states. Individuals seeking employment opportunities and training can receive services from more than a dozen federal programs that are required to offer their services through these one-stop centers. Unlike the JTPA adult program, WIA imposes no income eligibility requirements for applicants receiving any of its “core” services, such as job search assistance and employment counseling and assessment. Any person visiting a one-stop center may look for a job, receive career development services, and gain access to a range of vocational education programs. While WIA consolidated the two JTPA youth programs and strengthened the service delivery of key workforce development programs, most employment and training programs remain separately funded and continue to be operated by various agencies.⁷

⁶WIA also repealed the Adult Education Act and replaced it with the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, amended the Wagner-Peyser Act (Employment Service) to require that the program’s activities be provided as part of the WIA one-stop system, and amended the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (vocational rehabilitation). WIA repealed other statutes as well.

⁷WIA repealed numerous Labor programs, some of which had not continued to be funded.

Multiple Programs Exist but Funding and Participation Are Concentrated Among a Few

We identified 40 programs that provide services intended to (1) help job seekers find employment, (2) enhance specific job skills in order to increase employability, or (3) identify job opportunities. Seven federal agencies administer these programs; however, Labor, Education, and HHS are responsible for 34 of the 40 programs. (See fig. 1.) Agencies estimated that their programs allocated at least \$11.7 billion to fund employment and training services in that same year. (See table 1.) (Agency officials responsible for five programs were unable to estimate the amount of their funding that goes to employment and training services.) Six of the 35 programs that provided funding data on employment and training services accounted for 64 percent of this amount (see fig. 2). Education operated the largest program in terms of funding—the State Vocational Rehabilitation Services program—which used about \$1.8 billion to fund employment and training services in fiscal year 1999. Labor administers four of the five other largest programs, and HHS administers the fifth. In contrast to these large programs, almost half of the 35 programs reported that they each allocated less than \$50 million to fund employment and training services in fiscal year 1999.

Figure 1: Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs by Agency, Fiscal Year 1999

Labor	• Disabled Veterans Outreach Program • Employment Service • Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Project • Job Corps^a • Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) • Title II-A Adult Training^b • Title II-B Summer Youth Employment and Training^b • Title II-C Youth Training^b • Title III Employment and Training Assistance—Dislocated Workers^b • Local Veterans' Employment Representative Program • Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers^a • Native American Employment and Training Programs^a • Registered Apprenticeship Training • Senior Community Service Employment Program • Trade Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA—Transitional Adjustment Assistance • Veterans' Employment Program^a • Welfare-to-Work Grants to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives • Welfare-to-Work Grants to States and Localities	Education	• Adult Education—State Grant Program • American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services • Grants to States for Incarcerated Youth Offenders • Migrant Education—High School Equivalency Program • Native American Vocational and Technical Education Program • Native Hawaiian Vocational Education • Projects with Industry • State Supported Employment Services Program • State Vocational Rehabilitation Services • Tribally Controlled Post-Secondary Vocational and Technical Institutions • Vocational Education—Basic Grants to States
Health and Human Services	• Community Services Block Grant • Community Services Block Grant—Discretionary Awards • Refugee Assistance—Voluntary Agency Programs • Refugee and Entrant Assistance—Targeted Assistance • Temporary Assistance for Needy Families • Tribal Work Grants	Agriculture	• Food Stamp Employment and Training Program
		Housing and Urban Development	• Opportunities for Youth—Youthbuild Program
		Interior	• Indian Employment Assistance • Indian Job Placement—United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation • Indian Vocational Training—United Tribes Technical College
		Veterans	• Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans

^aThese programs were previously authorized by JTPA and reauthorized under WIA.

^bWIA programs replaced JTPA programs, effective July 1, 2000.

Table 1: Estimated Proportion of Fiscal Year 1999 Budget Appropriation Used on Employment and Training Services and Activities

Program	Amount used	Appropriation	Percentage used
State Vocational Rehabilitation Services	\$1,792,128,000	\$2,287,128,000	78
Welfare-to-Work Grants to States and Localities	1,500,000,000	1,500,000,000	100
JTPA Employment and Training Assistance—Dislocated Workers (Title III) ^a	1,309,994,700	1,350,510,000	97
Job Corps ^b	1,308,000,000	1,308,000,000	100
JTPA Summer Youth Employment and Training (Title II-B) ^a	871,000,000	871,000,000	100
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families ^c	869,164,720	17,692,000,000	5
Employment Service	761,700,000	761,700,000	100
JTPA Adult Training (Title II-A) ^a	731,222,314	955,000,000	77
Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans	483,690,000	483,690,000	100
Senior Community Service Employment Program	440,200,000	440,200,000	100
Adult Education—State Grant Program	365,000,000	365,000,000	100
Vocational Education—Basic Grants to States ^d	327,240,000	1,013,128,950	32
Food Stamp Employment and Training Program	186,292,309	269,354,000	69
JTPA Youth Training (Title II-C) ^a	130,000,000	130,000,000	100
Trade Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA—Transitional Adjustment Assistance	120,000,000	360,700,000	33
Disabled Veterans Outreach Program	80,010,000	80,040,000	100
Local Veterans' Employment Representative Program	77,078,000	77,078,000	100
Native American Employment and Training Programs ^b	69,639,842	69,639,842	100
Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers ^b	67,596,408	71,517,000	95
Refugee and Entrant Assistance—Targeted Assistance	44,529,300	49,477,000	90
State Supported Employment Services Program	37,770,000	38,152,000	99
Community Services Block Grant—Discretionary Awards	26,560,000	26,560,000	100
Projects with Industry	21,850,290	22,071,000	99
Opportunities for Youth—Youthbuild Program	19,500,000	39,600,000	49
Registered Apprenticeship Training	17,660,000	17,660,000	100
American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services	17,283,000	17,283,000	100
Welfare-to-Work Grants to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives	15,000,000	15,000,000	100
Indian Employment Assistance	10,859,000	10,859,000	100
Veterans' Employment Program ^b	7,300,000	7,300,000	100
Refugee Assistance—Voluntary Agency Programs	5,900,000	43,100,000	14
Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Project	2,994,332	3,000,000	100
Tribal Work Grants	1,700,000	1,700,000	100

(Continued From Previous Page)

Program	Amount used	Appropriation	Percentage used
Migrant Education-High School Equivalency Program	900,000	9,000,000	10
Native Hawaiian Vocational Education	231,103	2,576,625	9
Indian Job Placement-United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation	107,000	107,000	100
Community Services Block Grant	^e	499,828,821	^e
Native American Vocational and Technical Education Program	^e	12,883,125	^e
Grants to States for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	^e	12,000,000	^e
Tribally Controlled Post-secondary Vocational and Technical Institutions	^e	4,100,000	^e
Indian Vocational Training-United Tribes Technical College	^e	2,370,000	^e
Total	\$11,720,100,318	\$30,920,313,363	

^aWIA programs replaced JTPA programs, effective July 1, 2000.


^bThese programs were previously authorized by JTPA and reauthorized under WIA.

^cTemporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program officials reported that this figure represents states' expenditures on "work activities" for fiscal year 1999. According to an HHS official, there was no federal definition of work activities for fiscal year 1999 when the data were collected.

^dIncludes only the proportion of grants that states used to fund postsecondary vocational education.

^eAgency officials were unable to estimate the amount spent on employment and training activities.

Figure 2: The Six Programs That Accounted for Nearly Two-Thirds of Funding Used for Employment and Training Services and Activities, Fiscal Year 1999



*This number includes only the proportion of the grants that states used to fund postsecondary vocational education.

^bThis program was previously authorized by JTPA and was reauthorized under WIA.

^cWIA programs replaced JTPA programs, effective July 1, 2000.

Twenty-five programs estimated that they used 90 percent or more of their fiscal year 1999 budget appropriation to fund employment and training services. Twenty of these programs reported that they used 100 percent of their funds on employment and training services, with Labor and Education administering three-fourths of these programs. Of the five programs that did not provide funding data on employment and training services, only one—the Community Services Block Grant (\$500 million)—received a substantial amount of appropriated funding in fiscal year 1999. Although appropriated funding for the 40 employment and training programs decreased somewhat from fiscal year 1999 to fiscal year 2000, the proportion of funding designated for employment and training services by the 34 programs that provided data for both years remained similar (see appendix I for fiscal year 2000 data).⁸

The number of participants each program served ranged from 318 to 12 million. (See table 2.) Seven of the 39 programs that were able to estimate the number of participants reported serving 500,000 or more individuals. Four of the seven programs—Employment Service, the Adult Education–State Grant Program, Vocational Education–Basic Grants to States, and State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program—each reported serving more than 1 million individuals. Education administers three of these four programs. In contrast to these larger programs, 14 programs each reported serving fewer than 5,000 individuals.

⁸TANF program officials were unable to provide an estimate of the funds used to support employment and training services for fiscal year 2000.

Table 2: Estimated Number of Program Participants Who Received Employment and Training Services, Fiscal Year 1999

Program	Number
Employment Service	12,000,000
Adult Education—State Grant Program	4,020,000
Vocational Education—Basic Grants to States	4,000,000 ^a
State Vocational Rehabilitation Services	1,200,000 ^b
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	875,000
Food Stamp Employment and Training Program	700,000
JTPA Employment and Training Assistance—Dislocated Workers (Title III) ^c	500,000
Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program	498,655
Local Veterans' Employment Representative Program	498,401
JTPA Summer Youth Employment and Training (Title II-B) ^c	480,000
Registered Apprenticeship Training	411,000
JTPA Adult Training (Title II-A) ^c	293,724
Welfare-to-Work Grants to States and Localities	142,500
JTPA Youth Training (Title II-C) ^c	120,000
Senior Community Service Employment Program	101,000
Job Corps ^d	70,685
Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans	52,000
Refugee and Entrant Assistance—Targeted Assistance	46,600
Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers ^d	42,200
State Supported Employment Services Program	37,008
Trade Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA—Transitional Adjustment Assistance	30,000
Tribal Work Grants	21,761
Refugee Assistance—Voluntary Agency Programs	24,000
Native American Employment and Training Programs ^d	19,367
Projects with Industry	13,945
Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Project	4,136
Indian Job Placement—United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation	3,683
Veterans' Employment Program ^a	3,615
American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services	3,200
Indian Employment Assistance	3,200
Grants to States for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	3,000
Welfare-to-Work Grants to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives	2,970

(Continued From Previous Page)

Program	Number
Opportunities for Youth–Youthbuild Program	2,767
Community Services Block Grant–Discretionary Awards	2,000
Native American Vocational and Technical Education Program	1,788
Migrant Education–High School Equivalency Program	1,600
Indian Vocational Training–United Tribes Technical College	559
Tribally Controlled Post-secondary Vocational and Technical Institutions	500
Native Hawaiian Vocational Education	318
Community Services Block Grant	^e

^aThis number includes only individuals participating in postsecondary vocational and technical educational institutions.

^bThis number includes the 37,008 individuals participating in the State Supported Employment Services program.

^cWIA programs replaced JTPA programs, effective July 1, 2000.

^dThese programs were previously authorized by JTPA and reauthorized under WIA.

^eProgram officials were unable to provide an estimate of the number of individuals who received employment and training services during fiscal year 1999.

Most Programs Serve a Primary Target Group and Some Have Overlapping Target Groups and Services

Thirty-three of the 40 programs served primarily one target group in fiscal year 1999, and most of these 33 programs offered their participants a wide range of workforce development activities. (While 13 of the 33 programs served only one group of individuals, 20 programs served multiple target groups but had one group as their primary target.) Some of these programs serve the same target population and offer similar services. Although some may serve the same general target population, some participants may be eligible for one program but not another because aspects of eligibility criteria differ.

Programs Target a Particular Group and Provide a Range of Services

Of the 33 programs that targeted a group of individuals in fiscal year 1999

- 10 targeted Native Americans;
 - 5 targeted youths;
 - 5 targeted veterans, including disabled veterans;
 - 3 targeted persons with disabilities; and
 - 3 targeted unemployed, underemployed, or hard-to-employ persons.
- (See fig. 3.)

Figure 3: Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs by Target Group, Fiscal Year 1999

Native Americans, Native Alaskans, and Native Hawaiians	• American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services • Indian Employment Assistance • Indian Job Placement—United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation • Indian Vocational Training—United Tribes Technical College • Native American Employment and Training Programs^a • Native American Vocational and Technical Education Program • Native Hawaiian Vocational Education • Tribal Work Grants • Tribally Controlled Post-Secondary Vocational and Technical Institutions • Welfare-to-Work Grants to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives	Persons With Physical or Mental Disabilities	• Projects with Industry • State Supported Employment Services Program • State Vocational Rehabilitation Services
Youths	• Grants to States for Incarcerated Youth Offenders • Job Corps^a • JTPA Title II-B Summer Youth Employment and Training^b • JTPA Title II-C Youth Training^b • Opportunities for Youth—Youthbuild Program	Dislocated Workers	• JTPA Title III Employment and Training Assistance—Dislocated Workers^b • Trade Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA—Transitional Adjustment Assistance
Veterans	• Disabled Veterans Outreach Program • Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Project • Local Veterans' Employment Representative Program • Veterans' Employment Program^a • Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	• Migrant Education—High School Equivalency Program • Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers^a
Unemployed, Underemployed, and Hard to Employ Persons	• Food Stamp Employment and Training Program • Temporary Assistance for Needy Families • Welfare-to-Work Grants to States and Localities	Refugees	• Refugee Assistance—Voluntary Agency Programs • Refugee and Entrant Assistance—Targeted Assistance
		Older Workers	• Senior Community Service Employment Program
		Multiple Groups	• Adult Education—State Grant Program • Community Services Block Grant • Community Services Block Grant—Discretionary Awards • Employment Service • JTPA Title II-A Adult Training^b • Registered Apprenticeship Training • Vocational Education—Basic Grants to States

^aThese programs were previously authorized by JTPA and reauthorized under WIA.


^bWIA programs replaced JTPA programs, effective July 1, 2000.

In addition to targeting a specific group, 12 of these 33 programs require that their participants be economically disadvantaged in order to receive services. For example, participants in four of the five youth programs must be economically disadvantaged to receive services.

Most of the 33 programs with a primary target population offered their participants a number of employment and training services. For example, 27 of the 33 targeted programs offered at least 6 employment and training services, and 16 programs offered 10 or more services.⁹ Twenty-nine of the 33 programs provided job search and job placement activities, 28 provided employment counseling and assessment, and 26 provided occupational or vocational training. (See fig. 4 and appendix II for information on individual programs and services offered.)

⁹In the questionnaire we administered to program officials, we cited 11 employment and training services and activities that are common among workforce development programs. We asked the officials to indicate which ones their programs funded during fiscal year 1999. We also gave them the opportunity to specify other services and activities that were not listed in the questionnaire but that their programs provided.

Figure 4: The Services and Activities of 33 Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs That Identified a Primary Target Population



Seven of the 40 programs did not identify a primary target group. All but one of these seven programs each served at least four different target groups, and two required that their participants be economically disadvantaged to receive services. (See table 3 for the 14 programs that

required participants to be economically disadvantaged.) Five of these seven programs served Native Americans, five served youths, and four served veterans. Three of the programs that served multiple target groups (Employment Service, Adult Education–State Grant Program, and Vocational Education–Basic Grants to States) are the largest in terms of the number of participants served. These seven programs also offered their participants a wide range of employment and training services, with almost all programs offering four or more services.

Table 3: Programs That Required That Their Participants Be Economically Disadvantaged in Order to Be Eligible for Services

Department	Program
Labor	Homeless Veterans Reintegration Project Job Corps ^a JTPA Adult Training (Title II-A) JTPA Summer Youth Employment and Training (Title II-B) JTPA Youth Training (Title II-C) Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers ^a Senior Community Services Employment Program Welfare-to-Work Grants to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives Welfare-to-Work Grants to States and Localities
HHS	Community Services Block Grant Temporary Assistance to Needy Families
Education	Migrant Education—High School Equivalency
Agriculture	Food Stamp Employment and Training Program
Housing and Urban Development	Opportunities for Youth—Youthbuild

Note: A few of these programs provide services to some participants who are not economically disadvantaged. For example, JTPA Adult (Title II-A) and JTPA Youth (Title II-C) programs permit up to 10 percent of participants to be individuals who are not economically disadvantaged if the participants face barriers to employment. In addition, the WIA adult and dislocated worker programs, which replaced the respective JTPA programs, do not require that participants be economically disadvantaged to receive services. However, if funds are limited, priority must be given to welfare recipients and low-income individuals for intensive and training services.

^aPreviously authorized by JTPA and reauthorized under WIA.

**Some Programs That Serve
the Same Target
Populations Provide Many
of the Same Services**

Programs that target Native Americans, youths, and veterans provide many of the same services. For example, of the 10 programs that targeted Native Americans in fiscal year 1999, 9 provided occupational or vocational training and 7 each offered employment counseling and assessment, job search and job placement activities, on-the-job training, and job readiness skills. (See table 4.) According to agency officials, fiscal year 1999 appropriated funding for most of these Native American programs was less than \$50 million, and most of these programs served fewer than 5,000 participants.¹⁰

¹⁰The Indian Employment, Training, and Related Services Demonstration Act (Public Law No. 102-477) authorizes tribal governments to combine the federal funds that they receive under formula grant programs related to employment or training under a single plan, a single budget, and a single reporting system. Participation is voluntary; no tribe is required to participate.

Table 4: Services That Programs Serving Native Americans Provided, Fiscal Year 1999

	Employment Counseling and Assessment	Job Search and Job Placement Activities	Job Referrals	Occupational or Vocational Training	On-the-Job Training	Job Readiness Skills
Native Americans	American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services	•	•	•	•	•
	Indian Employment Assistance	•	•	•	•	•
	Indian Job Placement—United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation	•	•	•	•	•
	Indian Vocational Training—United Tribes Technical College	•	•	•	•	•
	Native American Employment and Training Programs ^a	•	•	•	•	•
	Native American Vocational and Technical Education Program			•		
	Native Hawaiian Vocational Education			•		
	Tribally Controlled Post-Secondary Vocational and Technical Institutions			•		
	Tribal Work Grants	•	•	•	•	•
	Welfare-to-Work Grants to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives	•	•		•	•

^aPreviously authorized by JTPA and reauthorized under WIA.

Programs that target youths also offer a similar array of services. For example, all five programs that target youths offer employment counseling and assessment, job search and job placement activities, job referrals, and job readiness. Programs that target veterans also offer many of the same services to their participants. For example, all five veterans programs offer employment counseling and assessment and job search and job placement activities. In addition, four of the five veterans programs offer job referrals. (See tables 5 and 6.) Appropriated funding for two of the youth and two of the veterans programs was less than \$50 million, and these programs served fewer than 5,000 participants.

Table 5: Services That Programs Serving Youths Provided, Fiscal Year 1999

		Employment Counseling and Assessment	Job Search and Job Placement Activities	Job Referrals	Job Readiness	Job Retention Training
Youths	Grants to States for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	•	•	•	•	
	Job Corps ^a	•	•	•	•	•
	JTPA Title II-B Summer Youth Employment and Training ^b	•	•	•	•	•
	JTPA Title II-C Youth Training ^b	•	•	•	•	•
	Opportunities for Youth—Youthbuild Program	•	•	•	•	

^aPreviously authorized by JTPA and reauthorized under WIA.

^bWIA programs replaced JTPA programs, effective July 1, 2000.

Table 6: Services That Programs Serving Veterans Provided, Fiscal Year 1999

		Employment Counseling and Assessment	Job Search and Job Placement Activities	Job Referrals	Job Readiness	Job Retention Training
Veterans	Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program	•	•	•	•	•
	Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Project	•	•	•	•	•
	Local Veterans' Employment Representative Program	•	•	•	•	•
	Veterans' Employment Program ^a	•	•			
	Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans	•	•	•	•	•

^aPreviously authorized by JTPA and reauthorized under WIA.

While many programs may serve the same general target populations, specific eligibility requirements differ, thereby excluding some segments of the target population. For example, one of the programs serving Native Americans served only disabled Native Americans residing on a federal or state reservation, and another served only Native Hawaiians. Similarly, one of the five youth programs served only incarcerated youths and one of the veterans programs served only homeless veterans. (See appendix III for more information on program objectives and beneficiary eligibility criteria.)

Additional Data Are Needed to Determine Whether Program Overlap Results in Duplication and Inefficiencies

We identified 40 employment and training programs administered by seven federal agencies, and we identified overlap among programs that serve the same target populations, such as those serving Native Americans, youths, and veterans. Such overlap indicates potential duplication among programs that serve the same participants and offer similar services. However, to determine whether these programs are actually duplicative—that is, whether they provide similar types of services to similar target groups—an analysis of the eligibility requirements for the target populations of each program would have to be conducted and information would have to be obtained on whether these programs are delivering similar services. In addition, to address inefficiencies, policymakers would need to know whether programs are effectively meeting their own program goals as well as federal strategic goals, the nature of program structures, including administrative costs, and the degree of coordination among programs that have similar objectives. Information derived from program evaluation and analysis that agencies, OMB, or others have done could also identify the degree of program inefficiencies as well as methods for addressing them. Such additional analysis could, for example, lead policymakers to direct agencies to better coordinate programs with other agencies that share the same program mission, integrate program services from one program into others, or consolidate several programs into one.¹¹

The Congress sought to encourage coordination among federally funded employment and training programs by enacting WIA. WIA has as its primary goal integrating and streamlining services by requiring that more than a dozen employment and training programs provide services at the

¹¹For a discussion of potential duplication among early childhood education programs, see *Early Education and Care: Overlap Indicates Need to Assess Crosscutting Programs* (GAO/HEHS-00-78, Apr. 28, 2000).

one-stop centers. The degree to which services are integrated and the form of service integration have generally been left to the states and localities to decide. However, WIA generally provides for greater local control and closer coordination among employment and training programs than before it was passed.¹² WIA also provides states with the opportunity to submit a single unified plan to meet the planning requirements of several federal statutes. Seventeen programs described in this report are mandatory partners in the one-stop centers.¹³

In addition, the Government Performance and Results Act can facilitate congressional oversight of issues that cut across several federal departments because the act requires agencies to develop strategic and annual performance plans that specify program goals, objectives, and performance measures that agencies can use to coordinate program efforts across the federal government.¹⁴ Program evaluations that assess performance may also be conducted by agencies or other entities to provide performance information on similar programs in order to facilitate comparisons of programs. Coordinating crosscutting programs is important because unfocused and uncoordinated crosscutting programs waste scarce funds, frustrate program customers, and limit overall program effectiveness.¹⁵ Moreover, as we reported in January 1995, many programs with common goals, comparable target groups, and similar services maintain separate administrative structures. In some cases, these programs

¹²See *Workforce Investment Act: Implementation Status and the Integration of TANF Services* (GAO/T-HEHS-00-145, June 29, 2000).

¹³The mandatory partners are Community Services Block Grant; Community Services Block Grant—Discretionary Awards; Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program; Employment Service; Job Corps; Local Veterans' Employment Representative Program; Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers Program; Native American Employment and Training Programs; Opportunities For Youth—Youthbuild Program; Senior Community Service Employment Program; State Vocational Rehabilitation Services; Trade Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA—Transitional Adjustment Assistance; Vocational Education—Basic Grants to States; Welfare-to-Work Grants to States and Localities; WIA Adults; WIA Dislocated Workers; WIA Youth.

¹⁴In addition, OMB has issued guidance stating that for crosscutting issues, agencies should describe efforts to coordinate so that goals are consistent and program efforts are mutually reinforcing. See *Results Act: Using Agency Performance Plans to Oversee Early Childhood Programs*, (GAO/T-HEHS-99-93, Mar. 25, 1999).

¹⁵*Managing for Results: Opportunities for Continued Improvements in Agencies' Performance Plans* (GAO/GGD/AIMD-99-215, July 20, 1999).

could realize substantial savings if they eliminated the separate staffs that administer, monitor, and evaluate programs.¹⁶

While agency performance plans often discuss coordination efforts with other federal programs that have similar goals, in the past we have found that few plans discuss planned strategies for coordination.¹⁷ We found that Labor's, Education's, and HHS' 2001 performance plans discuss, to a limited degree, efforts to coordinate with other federal agencies. We recently reported that Labor's 1999 Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2001 Plan includes goals that indirectly address coordination, as well as strategies that include coordination efforts.¹⁸ Labor, for example, in discussing its crosscutting issues, briefly describes its work with other federal, state, and local agencies to develop a new performance measurement system for WIA programs. In addition, Labor cites crosscutting federal efforts regarding the Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Project, noting that Labor works closely with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to refer homeless veterans who need social services to appropriate programs. Veterans are then referred back to Labor's program for job assistance. Labor's report also states that it "will establish linkages" with HHS programs that deal with educational or workforce activities for youths who live in high-poverty areas, as well as with HUD's Youthbuild program.

We also recently reported that while the Administration for Children and Families (which administers the HHS programs cited in this report) does not have goals that directly address coordination, HHS' most recent performance report and plan discuss how these programs have worked with their various partners to develop program-specific goals.¹⁹ However, in general, its performance report and plan provide little, if any, information on specific coordination efforts regarding its employment and training programs. For example, no mention is made of efforts to coordinate

¹⁶See GAO/T-HEHS-95-53.

¹⁷See GAO/GGD/AIMD-99-215.

¹⁸*Observations on the Department of Labor's Fiscal Year 1999 Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Plan* (GAO/HEHS-00-125R, June 30, 2000).

¹⁹*Observations on the Department of Health and Human Services' Fiscal Year 1999 Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Plan* (GAO/HEHS-00-127R, June 30, 2000).

services that Native American programs provide with those of Labor and Education.

In addition, Education notes in its 1999 performance reports and 2001 performance plans that its strategies for building interagency collaboration include identifying common goals and combining or streamlining similar services. However, Education provides few examples in its performance plans on how it will coordinate its relevant programs with employment and training programs that other agencies administer. For example, Education's plans note that State Vocational Rehabilitation Services and Adult Education will coordinate with Labor in conducting workforce activities under WIA but does not explain how these two programs will coordinate their services. In addition, while the report states that American Indian Vocational Rehabilitative Services will coordinate with HHS' Administration for Native Americans, it gives no information on specific program activities related to coordination between this program and HHS' Native American programs.

Individual agency performance plans and a greater role for OMB in coordinating crosscutting programs could provide for enhanced interagency coordination. In a recent report, we concluded that agencies could improve their performance plans by focusing on areas that offer the greatest opportunities for continuing improvements, including coordinating crosscutting programs.²⁰ In that report, we recommended that OMB ensure that executive agencies improve the usefulness of performance planning for congressional and executive branch decisionmaking. Part of this improvement would include coordinating crosscutting programs, with particular attention to demonstrating that crosscutting programs are taking advantage of opportunities to employ complementary performance goals, mutually reinforcing strategies, and common or complementary performance measures. In responding to our recommendation, the Director of OMB stated that OMB will continue working with agencies to enhance the coverage of crosscutting efforts within agencies' performance plans but expects the process of developing goals for crosscutting programs to take several years.²¹ Labor officials told us that OMB meets monthly with the Assistant Secretaries from nine

²⁰See GAO/GGD/AIMD-99-215.

²¹November 22, 1999, letter from the Director of OMB to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs regarding our recommendation that OMB ensure that agencies improve their performance planning.

federal agencies that are responsible for administering the one-stop programs and that over the past year the group published "unified planning guidance as well as a technical assistance guide on cost allocation and resource sharing."

In another recent report, we concluded that OMB could use the governmentwide performance plan, which is to be based on agency performance plans, to more directly address crosscutting programs.²² As agencies work with OMB to develop their annual performance plans, they could consider the extent to which goals are complementary and the need for common performance measures and use this reporting process to show how the goals were met and, if they are unmet, what actions they need to take to meet these goals. Moreover, the governmentwide performance plan and annual performance reports could set the stage for a more integrated and focused dialogue between the Congress and the administration about priorities and how the agencies interact in implementing those priorities.

Agency Comments and Our Evaluation

We provided Education, HHS, HUD, Labor, VA, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of the Interior with the opportunity to comment on a draft of this report. Formal comments from Education, HHS, HUD, Labor, Interior, and VA appear in appendixes IV-IX. In addition to the comments discussed below, Education, HHS, and Labor provided technical comments that we incorporated where appropriate. Agriculture officials stated that they had no comments.

HUD and VA agreed with the findings in our report as they pertain to their programs and provided no comments regarding changes to the report. HHS stated that it supports efforts to coordinate services and activities among federal programs and provided as an example its coordination efforts related to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program and WIA. Interior also noted its efforts to coordinate services provided through Native American programs. Interior pointed out that the Indian Employment, Training, and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 authorizes tribes to combine funds received under individual programs into

²²The Government Performance and Results Act requires the president to include with the annual budget submission a federal government performance plan. The Congress intended that this plan would provide a comprehensive picture of the annual performance goals for the fiscal year. See *Managing for Results: Barriers to Interagency Coordination* (GAO/GGD-00-106, Mar. 29, 2000.)

one comprehensive program and said that tribes may choose to combine some of the Native American programs in our report.

Both Education and Labor noted the critical role of states and localities in the implementation of WIA. Education commented that planning, decision making, and service delivery under WIA training programs are state and local responsibilities and that WIA gives states and local agencies flexibility and responsibility in order to promote local coordination among partner programs. Labor noted the potential for the consolidation of education and training services provided by the one-stop partners at the state and local levels. We agree that one-stop centers have the potential for coordinating and streamlining services offered by the partners. Because WIA was just recently implemented, it is too soon to determine how well states are coordinating their services through the one-stops. States face challenges as they work to integrate their services at one-stop centers. These include establishing and formalizing partnerships, as required under WIA, and integrating program services while responding to the multiple federal requirements for these programs.²³

Education also said that the majority of its programs in our study have broader goals than providing employment and services and that for all but one program, those services are a small part of program services. While we agree that many of Education's programs have the advancement of education as a program goal, each program in our study has an important component related to employment and training. Six of the 11 programs included in our report are vocational and technical programs that serve individuals striving to improve skills that lead to improved job opportunities. In addition, Education officials responsible for 5 of the 11 education programs in our review reported that their programs used 78 percent or more of their fiscal year 1999 appropriation on employment and training services, with 4 programs spending 99 percent or more on these services. Moreover, several Education programs are mandatory partners in WIA one-stop centers.

Finally, Labor commented that our report suggests that one program might appropriately serve individuals participating in youth and veterans programs. We did not intend to imply that youth and veterans programs overlap one another. We discussed overlap among programs serving youths


²³See GAO/T-HEHS-00-145 for a discussion of states' efforts to coordinate programs under one-stop centers.

and overlap among programs serving veterans. We have clarified the text where appropriate.

We are sending copies of this report to the Honorable Dan Glickman, Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable Richard W. Riley, Secretary of Education; the Honorable Donna E. Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services; the Honorable Andrew M. Cuomo, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; the Honorable Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Alexis Herman, Secretary of Labor; the Honorable Togo D. West Jr., Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and appropriate congressional committees. We will also make copies available to others on request.

If you or your staff have any questions about this report, please contact me at (202) 512-7003 or Carol Dawn Petersen at (202) 512-7066. Key contributors to this report are listed in appendix X.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sigurd R. Nilsen". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Sigurd R. Nilsen
Director, Education, Workforce, and
Income Security Issues

Estimated Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations Used for Employment and Training Services

Program	Amount used	Appropriation	Percentage used
State Vocational Rehabilitation Services	\$2,190,587,000	\$2,315,587,000	95
WIA Dislocated Workers	1,589,025,000	1,589,025,000	100
Job Corps ^a	1,358,000,000	1,358,000,000	100
WIA Youth	1,240,965,000	1,240,965,000	100
WIA Adults	950,000,000	950,000,000	100
Employment Service	761,700,000	761,700,000	100
Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans	499,016,000	499,016,000	100
Adult Education-State Grant Program	441,916,000	441,916,000	100
Senior Community Service Employment Program	440,200,000	440,200,000	100
Vocational Education-Basic Grants to States ^b	333,337,000	1,032,003,440	32
Food Stamp Employment and Training Program	260,000,000	329,904,000	79
Trade Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance	123,000,000	415,150,000	30
Disabled Veterans Outreach Program	80,215,000	80,215,000	100
Local Veterans' Employment Representation Program	77,253,000	77,253,000	100
Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers ^a	69,750,000	74,195,000	94
Native American Employment and Training Programs ^a	68,814,475	68,814,475	100
Refugee and Entrant Assistance-Targeted Assistance	44,529,300	49,477,000	90
State Supported Employment Services Program	37,770,000	38,152,000	99
Community Services Block Grant-Discretionary Awards	26,560,000	26,560,000	100
American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services	23,390,000	23,390,000	100
Projects with Industry	21,741,417	22,071,000	99
Opportunities for Youth-Youthbuild Program	20,000,000	40,000,000	50
Registered Apprenticeship Training	19,141,000	19,141,000	100
Indian Employment Assistance	17,724,845	17,724,845	100
Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Project	9,600,000	9,636,000	100
Veterans' Employment Program ^a	7,300,000		100 ^c
Refugee Assistance-Voluntary Agency Programs	6,800,000	53,600,000	13
Tribal Work Grants	1,700,000	1,700,000	100
Migrant Education-High School Equivalency Program	1,500,000	15,000,000	10
Native Hawaiian Vocational Education	250,000	2,639,125	9
Indian Job Placement-United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation	0	0	d
Welfare-to-Work Grants to States and Localities	0	0	d
Welfare-to-Work Grants to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives	0	0	d

Appendix I
Estimated Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations
Used for Employment and Training Services

Program	Amount used	Appropriation	Percentage used
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	^e	16,689,000,000	^e
Community Services Block Grant	^e	527,700,000	^e
Grants to States for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	^e	14,000,000	^e
Native American Vocational and Technical Education Program	^e	13,195,625	^e
Tribally Controlled Post-secondary Vocational and Technical Institutions	^e	4,600,000	^e
Indian Vocational Training--United Tribes Technical College	^e	2,370,000	^e
Total	\$10,721,785,037	\$29,251,200,510	

^aPreviously authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and reauthorized under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA).

^bIncludes only the proportion of the grants that states used to fund postsecondary vocational education.

^cRounded up to 100 from 99.6.

^dNot funded in fiscal year 2000. Labor's Welfare-to-Work program and Welfare-to-Work to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives were authorized to provide funding to states only during fiscal years 1998 and 1999. In addition, the Indian Job Placement--United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation was not funded in fiscal year 2000.

^eAgency officials were unable to estimate the amount spent on employment and training activities.

Services and Activities of Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs That Identified Primary Target Groups

		Employment Counseling and Assessment	General Equivalency Diploma Assistance	Job Development
Labor	Disabled Veterans Outreach Program	•		•
	Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Project	•		•
	Job Corps ^a	•	•	•
	JTPA Title III Employment and Training Assistance—Dislocated Workers ^b	•	•	•
	JTPA Title II-B Summer Youth Employment and Training ^c	•	•	
	JTPA Title II-C Youth Training ^d	•	•	
	Local Veterans' Employment Representative Program	•		•
	Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers ^e	•	•	
	Native American Employment and Training Programs ^f	•	•	•
	Senior Community Service Employment	•	•	•
	Trade Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA—Transitional Adjustment Assistance		•	
	Veterans' Employment Program ^g	•		•
	Welfare-to-Work Grants to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives	•		
Education	Welfare-to-Work Grants to States and Localities	•	•	
	American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services	•	•	•
	Grants to States for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	•		
	Migrant Education—High School Equivalency Program	•	•	
	Native American Vocational and Technical Education Program			
	Native Hawaiian Vocational Education			
	Projects with Industry	•		•
	State Supported Employment Services Program			•
	State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program	•		•
HHS	Tribally Controlled Post-Secondary Vocational and Technical Institutions			
	Refugee Assistance—Voluntary Agency Programs	•		•
	Refugee and Entrant Assistance—Targeted Assistance	•		•
	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	•	•	•
Interior	Tribal Work Grants	•	•	•
	Indian Employment Assistance	•	•	•
	Indian Job Placement—United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation	•	•	•
	Indian Vocational Training—United Tribes Technical College	•	•	•
Agriculture	Food Stamp Employment and Training Program	•	•	•
HUD	Opportunities for Youth—Youthbuild Program	•	•	•
Veterans	Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans	•	•	•

Appendix II
Services and Activities of Federally Funded
Employment and Training Programs That
Identified Primary Target Groups

Job Readiness Skills	Job Referrals	Job Retention Training	Job Search and Job Placement Activities	Occupational or Vocational Training	On-the-Job Training	Remedial Academic and English Language Training	Work Experience	Other Services
•	•	•	•					•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
	•		•	•	•	•		
•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•					
	•		•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
		•	•	•	•	•		•
			•					•
•			•		•		•	•
•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•		•	•				•
			•					
				•				•
				•				•
•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•
		•			•			•
•	•	•	•	•	•			•
				•				•
•	•	•	•			•		•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•		•	•		•		
•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•

^aPreviously authorized by JTPA and reauthorized under WIA.

^bWIA programs replaced JTPA programs, effective July 1, 2000.

Program Objectives and Eligibility Criteria for Federally Funded Employment and Training Programs

Program (department)	Objective	Eligibility criteria
Dislocated workers		
JTPA Employment and Training Assistance—Dislocated Workers (Title III) (replaced by WIA) (Labor)	To assist dislocated workers obtain unsubsidized employment through training and related employment services using primarily a decentralized system of state and local programs.	Individuals who have been terminated or laid off or have received a notice of termination or lay-off and who are not likely to return to their previous industry or occupation or who have received a notice of termination as a result of a permanent closure; individuals who were self-employed but are unemployed because of community economic conditions or natural disaster; displaced homemakers; and the long-term unemployed (not applicable under the WIA-Dislocated Worker Program).
Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and NAFTA—Transitional Adjustment Assistance (Labor)	To provide retraining, job search, or relocation assistance to workers adversely affected by increased imports in order to facilitate their return to the workforce in suitable employment.	The Department of Labor must find a TAA beneficiary to have been adversely affected by increased imports and eligible to apply for adjustment assistance. Eligibility requirements for NAFTA-TAA are primarily the same as the TAA requirements, with the addition that individuals may be eligible if they are adversely affected by plant relocation to Mexico or Canada.
WIA Dislocated Workers (effective July 2000) (Labor)	To design, with states and local communities, a revitalized workforce investment system that provides workers with the information, advice, job search assistance, and training they need to get and keep good jobs and to provide employers with skilled workers.	Core services are accessible to dislocated workers, as defined by statute, through local one-stop centers. Intensive services may be provided to dislocated workers who are unemployed and unable to obtain employment through core services. Employed adults and dislocated workers in need of intensive services in order to obtain or retain employment that allows for self-sufficiency are also eligible to receive intensive services. Individuals who have met the eligibility requirements for intensive services may receive training services if they are unable to obtain or retain employment through the intensive services, if they are able to participate successfully, and if the training is linked to available employment opportunities.
Migrant and seasonal farmworkers		
Migrant Education—High School Equivalency Program (Education)	To assist students who are engaged, or whose parents are engaged, in migrant and other seasonal farmwork to obtain the equivalent of a secondary school diploma and subsequently to gain employment or be placed in an institution of higher education or other postsecondary education or training.	Persons who are engaged or whose parents are engaged in migrant and other seasonal farmwork or who have participated or have been eligible to participate in Title I, MEP, or the JTPA 402 program. Eligible beneficiaries are 16 and older or beyond the age of compulsory school attendance and lack a high school diploma.

**Appendix III
Program Objectives and Eligibility Criteria
for Federally Funded Employment and
Training Programs**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Program (department)	Objective	Eligibility criteria
Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers (Labor)	To provide job training, job search assistance, and other supportive services to persons who suffer chronic seasonal unemployment and underemployment in the agricultural industry and to enable farmworkers and their dependents to obtain or retain employment.	Seasonal farmworkers who have been primarily employed in agricultural labor that is characterized by chronic unemployment or underemployment and migrant farmworkers whose agricultural labor requires travel to a job site such that they are unable to return to a permanent place of residence within the same day. Eligible families are disadvantaged.
Multiple target groups		
Adult Education—State Grant Program (Education)	To create a partnership among the federal government, states, and localities to provide, on a voluntary basis, adult education and literacy services in order to help adults obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for employment and self-sufficiency; to help adults who are parents obtain the educational skills necessary to become full partners in the educational development of their children; and to help adults complete a secondary school education.	Adults (at least 16 years old) who are not enrolled or required to be enrolled in secondary school under state law and who lack sufficient mastery of basic educational skills or do not have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have not achieved an equivalent level of education or who are unable to speak, read, or write English.
Community Services Block Grant (HHS)	To provide assistance to states and local communities, working through a network of community action agencies and other neighborhood-based organizations, to reduce poverty, revitalize low-income communities, and empower low-income families and individuals in rural and urban areas; to assist low-income participants, including the elderly poor, to secure and retain meaningful employment and to attain an adequate education.	Locally based nonprofit community antipoverty agencies and other eligible entities that provide services to low-income individuals and families. The income limit is not to exceed 125 percent of the official HHS poverty line.
Community Services Block Grant—Discretionary Awards (HHS)	To support program activities of national or regional significance to alleviate the causes of poverty in distressed communities; to promote full-time permanent jobs for poverty-level project area residents, income or ownership opportunities (or both) for low-income community members, a better standard of living for rural low-income individuals in terms of water and waste-water treatment; and to provide character-building, sports, and physical fitness activities for low-income youths.	Low-income individuals or families, as defined by HHS.
Employment Service (Labor)	To place persons in employment by providing a variety of placement-related services without charge to job seekers or to employers seeking qualified individuals to fill job openings.	All employers seeking workers, persons seeking employment, and associated groups. Priority service is given to veterans, with disabled veterans receiving preferential treatment over other veterans.

Appendix III
Program Objectives and Eligibility Criteria
for Federally Funded Employment and
Training Programs

(Continued From Previous Page)

Program (department)	Objective	Eligibility criteria
JTPA Adult Training (Title II-A) (replaced by WIA) (Labor)	To establish programs to prepare economically disadvantaged adults facing serious barriers to employment for participation in the labor force by providing job training and other services that will result in increased employment and earnings, increased educational and occupational skills, and decreased welfare dependency.	Economically disadvantaged adults facing serious barriers to employment, with not less than 65 percent in one or more of the following categories: basic skills deficient; school dropouts; recipients of cash welfare payments; offenders; individuals with disabilities; homeless.
Registered Apprenticeship Training (Labor)	Planning and directing a national workforce system to improve the skills of the nation's workforce through programs of apprenticeship and other employment-connected skill training, to ensure equality of access into these programs, to encourage states to take similar action with respect to their labor force, and to make available an advisory service on training to employers and unions.	Individuals must be at least 16 years old and must satisfy other minimum qualifications required by a registered apprenticeship program sponsor.
Vocational Education—Basic Grants to States (Education)	To develop more fully the academic, vocational, and technical skills of secondary students and postsecondary students who enroll in vocational and technical education, through challenging academic standards, integrating academic and technical education, and linking secondary to postsecondary education.	Local educational agencies and postsecondary educational institutions with vocational and technical education programs. The beneficiaries are secondary students and postsecondary students who enroll in vocational and technical education.
WIA Adults (effective July 2000) (Labor)	To design, with states and local communities, a revitalized, workforce investment system that provides workers with the information, advice, job search assistance, and training they need to get and keep good jobs and to provide employers with skilled workers.	Core services are universally accessible to adult workers through local one-stop centers. Intensive services may be provided to adult workers who are unemployed and unable to obtain employment through core services. Employed adult workers in need of intensive services in order to obtain or retain employment that allows for self-sufficiency are also eligible to receive intensive services. Individuals who have met the eligibility requirements for intensive services may receive training services if they are unable to obtain or retain employment through the intensive services, if they are able to participate successfully, and if the training is linked to available employment opportunities.
Native Americans, Native Alaskans, and Native Hawaiians		
American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services (Education)	To provide vocational rehabilitation services to American Indians with disabilities who reside on or near federal or state reservations, consistent with their individual strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, and capabilities, so that they may prepare for and engage in gainful employment.	American Indians with disabilities residing on or near a federal or state reservation (including Native Alaskans).
Indian Employment Assistance (Interior)	To provide vocational training and employment opportunities to eligible American Indians and reduce federal dependence.	Eligible applicants must be members of a tribe, need financial assistance, and reside on or near an Indian reservation.

**Appendix III
Program Objectives and Eligibility Criteria
for Federally Funded Employment and
Training Programs**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Program (department)	Objective	Eligibility criteria
Indian Job Placement—United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation (Interior)	To provide job development, counseling, social adjustment guidance, and referrals to job training programs and other assistance programs through the United Sioux Tribes Development Corporation located in Pierre, South Dakota.	Members of a federally recognized Indian tribe who live on or near an Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
Indian Vocational Training—United Tribes Technical College (Interior)	To provide vocational training to individual American Indians through the United Tribes Technical College in Bismarck, North Dakota.	Members of a federally recognized Indian tribe who live on or near an Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
Native American Employment and Training Programs (Labor)	To support comprehensive employment and training activities for Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians; to develop more fully their academic, occupational, and literacy skills; to make them more competitive in the workforce; to promote the economic and social development and self-sufficiency of Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian communities.	Members of a federally recognized tribe, Alaska Natives, or Native Hawaiians. Recipients must also be any one of the following: unemployed or underemployed, a low-income individual, or the recipient of a layoff notice who is in need of employment and training services to obtain or retain employment that allows for self-sufficiency.
Native American Vocational and Technical Education Program (Education)	To support vocational and technical education activities provided by Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Alaska Native organizations.	Grantees are federally recognized Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Alaskan Natives.
Native Hawaiian Vocational Education (Education)	To provide quality vocational and technical education through organizations primarily serving and representing Native Hawaiians.	Native Hawaiians.
Tribal Work Grants (HHS)	To allow eligible Indian tribes and Alaska Native organizations to operate a program to make work activities available.	Service areas and populations as designated by eligible Indian tribes or Alaska Native organizations.
Tribally Controlled Post-Secondary Vocational and Technical Institutions (Education)	To support the increased capacity of Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions to provide quality vocational and technical education for Indian students.	American Indians and Native Alaskans.
Welfare-to-Work Grants to Federally Recognized Tribes and Alaska Natives (Labor)	To assist federally recognized Indian tribes and Alaska Native regional nonprofit corporations to move hard-to-employ welfare recipients into lasting unsubsidized jobs and family self-sufficiency.	At least 70 percent of grant funds must be spent on long-term welfare recipients or on noncustodial parents. Projects may also spend up to 30 percent of grant funds on TANF recipients who have characteristics associated with long-term welfare dependency.
Older workers		
Senior Community Service Employment Program (Labor)	To provide, foster, and promote part-time work opportunities (usually 20 hours per week) in community service activities for unemployed low-income individuals who are 55 years old or older. The program assists and promotes the transition of program enrollees into unsubsidized employment.	Adults 55 years old or older with a family income at or below 125 percent of the HHS poverty level.

**Appendix III
Program Objectives and Eligibility Criteria
for Federally Funded Employment and
Training Programs**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Program (department)	Objective	Eligibility criteria
Persons with disabilities		
Projects With Industry (Education)	To create and expand job and career opportunities for individuals with disabilities in the competitive labor market by partnering with private industry in the rehabilitation process, to identify the skills needed to perform such jobs, to create practical job and career readiness and training programs, and to provide job placements and career advancements.	Individuals with disabilities or significant disabilities who require vocational services to prepare for, secure, retain, or regain employment.
State Supported Employment Services Program (Education)	Provides grants to help states develop and implement collaborative programs with appropriate entities to provide supported employment services for individuals with the most significant disabilities to enable them to achieve supported employment.	Individuals with the most significant disabilities for whom supported employment has been identified as appropriate on the basis of an assessment of rehabilitation needs conducted under the State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program.
State Vocational Rehabilitation Services (Education)	Provides grants to assist states in operating statewide comprehensive programs, each of which is an integral part of a statewide workforce investment system and designed to assess, plan, develop, and provide vocational rehabilitation services for individuals with disabilities.	The presence of a physical or mental impairment that constitutes or results in a substantial impediment to employment. A qualified vocational rehabilitation counsel or must determine that the applicant requires services to prepare for, secure, retain, or regain employment.
Refugees		
Refugee Assistance—Voluntary Agency Programs (HHS)	The program emphasizes early employment and intensive services during the first 4 months after arrival to help refugees attain self-sufficiency without access to public cash assistance.	Refugees are determined eligible by the grantee agencies as verified by HHS monitoring. The term refugee applies to refugees, asylees, Amerasian immigrants from Vietnam, and Cuban or Haitian entrants.
Refugee and Entrant Assistance—Targeted Assistance (HHS)	To provide funding for employment-related and other social services for refugees, Amerasians, and entrants in areas of high refugee concentration and high welfare utilization.	Persons admitted to the United States as refugees, Cuban and Haitian entrants, and certain Amerasians from Vietnam and their accompanying family.
Unemployed, underemployed, and hard to employ persons		
Food Stamp Employment and Training Program (Agriculture)	To help job-ready Food Stamp recipients find work and to assist others to gain skills, training, or experience that will lead to their employment.	All nonexempt Food Stamp applicants and recipients who have been assigned by the state agency. Exempted are persons younger than 16 and older than 60, persons physically or mentally unable to work, persons responsible for the care of a child younger than 6 or an incapacitated individual, students, TANF recipients or recipients of unemployment compensation, employed persons, or persons participating in a drug or alcohol treatment program. Specifically targeted are able-bodied adults without dependents.

**Appendix III
Program Objectives and Eligibility Criteria
for Federally Funded Employment and
Training Programs**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Program (department)	Objective	Eligibility criteria
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (HHS)	To provide assistance to needy families with children so that children can be cared for in their own homes; to reduce dependency by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage; to reduce and prevent out-of-wedlock pregnancies; and to encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.	Needy families with children, as determined eligible by the state, territory, or tribe in accordance with the state or tribal plan submitted to HHS.
Welfare-to-Work Grants to States and Localities (Labor)	To help states and localities move hard-to-employ welfare recipients into lasting unsubsidized jobs and self-sufficiency.	At least 70 percent of the funds must be spent on long-term welfare recipients and certain noncustodial parents; up to 30 percent may be spent on other low-income individuals who meet specific program requirements.
Veterans		
Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program (Labor)	To provide outreach to veterans and to provide jobs and job training opportunities for disabled and other veterans through contacts with employers, community-based groups and organizations, and appropriate grantees under other federal and federally funded employment and training programs.	Special consideration is given to disabled veterans and to educationally and economically disadvantaged veterans.
Homeless Veterans Reintegration Project (Labor)	To provide funds for demonstration programs to expedite the reintegration of homeless veterans into the labor force.	Homeless veterans.
Local Veterans' Employment Representative Program (Labor)	To provide job development, placement, and support services directly to veterans.	Veterans and separating service members still on active duty but not yet technically considered veterans. Specifically, disabled veterans, homeless veterans, veterans with combat experience, economically or educationally disadvantaged veterans in need of training or retraining to become marketable in the local labor market, or veterans in need of a state license or certification to practice or work in a specific field.
Veterans' Employment (Labor)	To develop programs to meet the employment and training needs of veterans.	Service-connected disabled veterans, veterans of the Vietnam era, and veterans who are recently separated from military service.
Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans (Veterans)	To provide all services and assistance necessary to enable veterans with service-connected disabilities to prepare for, obtain, or maintain suitable employment. When the severity of the disability does not permit employment, the program can provide services and assistance to help the individual learn skills to achieve maximum independence in daily living.	Veterans of World War II and later service with a service-connected disability and veterans with disabilities who have a serious employment handicap.

**Appendix III
Program Objectives and Eligibility Criteria
for Federally Funded Employment and
Training Programs**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Program (department)	Objective	Eligibility criteria
Youths		
Grants to States for Incarcerated Youth Offenders (Education)	To assist incarcerated youth offenders in obtaining postsecondary education and postsecondary vocational training. Measured objectives are lower recidivism, academic achievement, job placement, and job retention.	Individuals who are incarcerated in a state prison, including a prerelease facility or an alternative program such as boot camp; are eligible to be released or paroled within 5 years; are 25 years old or younger; and have a secondary school diploma or its equivalent.
Job Corps (Labor)	A residential program that provides job training and job-readiness skills to youths facing multiple barriers to employment in order to provide long-term attachment to the labor market.	Low-income youths, usually drop-outs, before graduation, 16 to 24, and legal residents or lawfully admitted permanent resident aliens. Includes foster children and disabled or homeless children.
JTPA Summer Youth Employment and Training (Title II-B) (replaced by WIA) (Labor)	To establish programs to prepare economically disadvantaged youths facing serious barriers to employment for participation in the labor force by providing job training and other services that will result in increased employment and earnings, increased educational and occupational skills, and decreased welfare dependency.	Economically disadvantaged youths aged 14 to 21.
JTPA Youth Training (Title II-C) (replaced by WIA) (Labor)	To establish programs to prepare economically disadvantaged youths facing serious barriers to employment for participation in the labor force by providing job training and other services that will result in increased employment and earnings, increased educational and occupational skills, and decreased welfare dependency.	Economically disadvantaged youths aged 16 to 21 (or 14 to 21 if provided for in a job training plan), not less than 65 percent in the following categories: basic skills deficient, pregnant or parenting, individuals with disabilities, homeless or runaway youths, and offenders. Out-of-school youths must also be economically disadvantaged.
Opportunities for Youth—Youthbuild Program (HUD)	Provides funding assistance for multidisciplinary activities and services to assist economically disadvantaged youths who have dropped out of high school to obtain the education and employment skills necessary to achieve economic self-sufficiency and develop leadership skills and a commitment to community development in low-income communities. The program also aims to expand the supply of permanent affordable housing for homeless persons and members of low-income families.	Very low-income youths aged 16 to 24 who have dropped out of high school. Special outreach efforts to recruit young women.
WIA Youth (effective July 2000) (Labor)	To design, with states and local communities, a revitalized workforce investment system that provides workers with the information, advice, job search assistance, and training they need to get and keep good jobs and to provide employers with skilled workers.	Low-income youths aged 14 to 21 who are deficient in basic literacy skills; school dropouts; homeless, runaway, or foster children; pregnant or parents; offenders; or individuals who require additional assistance to complete an educational program or to secure and hold employment.

Comments From the Department of Education



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

September 8, 2000

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

Ms. Cynthia M. Fagnoni
Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues
United States General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Ms. Fagnoni:

The Secretary has asked that I respond to your letter dated August 22, 2000, requesting the Department of Education's review of the draft report entitled *Multiple Employment and Training Programs: Overlap Among Programs Indicates Need for Closer Examination of Program Structure* (GAO/HEHS-00-173). We appreciate the opportunity to review the report and are submitting some clarifications and corrections with this letter. In this letter, I am providing some additional information about the Department's programs included in the study and their coordination with other programs under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA).

The Department of Education Programs Included in the Study

The report defines "employment and training programs" as those programs that directly fund or support employment and training services and activities and that have as a key program goal providing assistance to individuals trying to find employment and/or improve their job skills. A majority of the Department's programs included in the report have broader goals than the provision of employment and training services and, for all programs except the vocational rehabilitation programs for individuals with disabilities, those services are a small part of program services.

The vocational rehabilitation programs included in the report (the State Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Services Program, the State Supported Employment Services Program, the American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Program, and the Projects with Industry Program) are limited to serving individuals with disabilities. The primary goal of these programs is to help individuals with disabilities prepare for, secure, regain, or retain employment. To achieve this goal, these programs offer many of the employment and training services you investigated (e.g., employment counseling and assessment, job development, job search assistance, and job placement). However, the State VR Services Program also provides a broad range of individually tailored services, such as medical services, personal assistance services, and rehabilitation technology that are typically not considered employment and training services. These other services are significant in that they represent about 17 percent of the cost of services purchased for VR participants.

The State Supported Employment (SE) Services Program is really a part of the larger State VR program. Although separately appropriated, SE funds are used to supplement VR program funds to pay for the additional costs of supported employment services for individuals with the most significant disabilities who require such services to be employed in the integrated labor market.

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-0500

Our mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the Nation.

Appendix IV
Comments From the Department of
Education

Page 2 -- Ms. Cynthia M. Fagnoni

The report also classified the Department's Vocational and Technical Education, Adult Education, and Migrant Education High School Equivalency programs as "employment and training programs" even though each of these programs has much broader purposes. Therefore, such a classification may be misleading. For instance, our Vocational and Technical Education programs have, as their primary goal, education leading to high school diplomas, technical certificates, and postsecondary degrees. The report includes the portion of the Vocational and Technical Education Grants to States that States choose to allocate to postsecondary institutions (which is about one-third of the total appropriation for State Grants), as well as the vocational and technical education programs serving Native Americans, Native Hawaiians, and the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions. Although vocational and technical education teaches students technical skills that are useful in the workplace, the programs focus on degree attainment, academic skills, and preparation for further education. While the training and employment activities investigated by this study are often offered by institutions that receive vocational education funds, such services do not account for much of the expenditures. The majority of the activities supported with Federal funds, such as teacher professional development and curriculum improvements, are not usually found in employment and training programs.

Adult Education and Family Literacy programs support adult basic skills, family literacy (which includes not only basic literacy but also parenting skills), high school completion, preparation for the GED exams, English Literacy, and English Literacy combined with civics education. The adults in these programs are improving their literacy for many different reasons. In fact, only a small percentage of participants have employment or career reasons for wanting to improve their literacy skills. Adult Education also helps adults meet their family, civic, citizenship, and everyday literacy needs. Therefore, while some programs offer job-related services, adult education programs primarily offer educational services. However, perhaps in recognition of the fact that improved literacy can improve an individual's employment, the authors chose to include 100 percent of this program in the study.

The Migrant Education High School Equivalency Program (HEP) helps students obtain a general education development diploma (GED). The program may provide supportive services that include placement services designed to place students in a university, college, or junior college program, or in military service or career positions. We estimate that the HEP grantees spend 10 percent or less of their funding on supportive services to help place students in postsecondary education, training programs, or in career positions. As with Vocational and Technical Education and Adult Education, HEP is clearly not primarily an employment and training program.

The Effects of WIA on Employment and Training and Education for the Workforce

The report's discussion of WIA focuses on the coordination of Federal agencies' activities. It is important to remember that the planning, decision making and service delivery under WIA training programs and the WIA partner programs are State and local responsibilities. WIA

Page 3 – Ms. Cynthia M. Fagnoni

purposefully gives State and local agencies flexibility and responsibility in order to promote local coordination among partner programs. Therefore, the most interesting story of WIA program coordination, effectiveness, and efficiency will be found at the State and local level. States have completed coordinated planning processes, and many States have chosen to submit one “unified plan” for a number of different WIA partner programs.

The report also includes discussion on the coordination of service delivery through the one-stop center system. The one-stop service centers are not yet fully developed in most States and communities. This year, based on local negotiations among the workforce investment boards and partner agencies, WIA will increase the coordination and streamlining of service delivery. Also, State agencies that administer WIA partner programs will be working over the next few years to improve existing data systems to facilitate the sharing of performance and other program data.

The Need for Closer Examination

We agree that a search for further opportunities to streamline employment and training programs and related education programs will require further examination. As you found, the eligibility criteria and allowable services established for each program by Congress are fundamental to the programs’ operations, and many of these programs serve a specific need or group not served by others. Identifying similar mandates and activities may not be the same as identifying “duplicative overlaps.”

Further examination will be necessary because States had not fully implemented WIA at the time of this study. States are just now making many of the changes planned to implement WIA and improve coordination across education and training. We think that WIA created both the opportunity and the challenge for these programs to have more effective services and more efficient administration. It will be interesting to see the results of further examination of employment and training programs after the reforms embodied in WIA take hold.

There are evaluations of the impact of WIA on employment and training programs and on the WIA partner programs, as well as a national evaluation of vocational and technical education underway. For example, the Department is conducting a study to assess how WIA is being implemented by vocational rehabilitation and adult education agencies at both the State and local levels. The study will examine WIA’s implementation from the perspectives of the State Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) and the Adult Education programs and the ways in which inclusion in the one-stop system affects interagency collaboration and the delivery of VR and adult education services. The study will also identify promising methods for serving VR consumers and adult education students through the one-stop system. In addition, the coordination of the Departments of Education and Labor’s accountability systems will be thoroughly described in the reports to Congress required under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and the Carl Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act.

The GAO’s report, in its focus on the descriptions of coordinated activity found in GPRA program plans, missed much of the detail about how these programs are coordinated at the


Appendix IV
Comments From the Department of
Education

Page 4 – Ms. Cynthia M. Fagnoni

Federal, State, and local levels. Because GPRA program plans cover so many different programs and activities, they do not catalog all the coordinated activities affecting each program. However, we make this information available to Congress and the public. We regularly inform staff of the principal congressional committees of jurisdiction of our coordinated efforts and of how the agencies are implementing WIA jointly. In addition, we regularly send information about Department of Education (ED) and Department of Labor (DOL) activities to the State agencies administering the programs. More details about coordinated activities can be found on the DOL and ED Web sites. For example, you will find guidelines we created to help States write unified plans for WIA. ED and DOL developed this guidance together and jointly reviewed all unified State plans. All guidance and regulations on WIA activities, and the performance accountability systems for the partner programs have been developed through close consultation among the two Departments. I invite any interested member of Congress or GAO to contact us for more information about the program coordination.

A list of proposed technical corrections to the report is enclosed.

Sincerely,



Frank S. Holleman III

Enclosure

Comments From the Department of Health and Human Services



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
Office of the Assistant Secretary, Suite 600
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20447

DATE: September 9, 2000

TO: June Gibbs Brown
Inspector General

FROM: Olivia A. Golden
Assistant Secretary
for Children and Families

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Olivia A. Golden".

SUBJECT: Comments on the GAO Draft Report, "Multiple Employment And Training Programs: Overlap Among Programs Indicates Need For Closer Examination Of Program Structure", (GAO/HEHS-00-173)

Attached are the comments on the above captioned report from the Administration for Children and Families. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this report. It provides a comprehensive look at federally funded employment and training programs, their target populations, funding levels, and the numbers of individuals they serve. It also offers valuable information to consider in evaluating the effectiveness of multiple programs and makes the important point that effective coordination among programs is vital to their success.

If you have questions or need further information, please contact Julie Siegel in the Office of Family Assistance at (202) 205-4777.

Appendix V
Comments From the Department of Health
and Human Services

COMMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES ON THE
U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE DRAFT REPORT, MULTIPLE EMPLOYMENT
AND TRAINING PROGRAMS: OVERLAP AMONG PROGRAMS INDICATES NEED FOR
CLOSER EXAMINATION OF PROGRAM STRUCTURE (GAO/HEHS-00-173)

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this report. We appreciate the work that has been done to compile information about Federally funded employment and training programs for which a key program goal is helping individuals find employment or improve job skills; including the information on targeted populations and the services provided by each program.

The report makes the point that effective coordination among employment and training programs is crucial to avoiding duplication and program inefficiency. We strongly support coordination and collaboration at all levels of government. We have taken as many opportunities as possible, both within our program guidance and in our technical assistance, to encourage effective and efficient programs, maximizing resources and providing seamless service to the individuals served. We consistently find that most "model" programs have as a core element strong and effective coordination and collaboration with other partners.

To illustrate our commitment to meaningful coordination in the employment and training arena, we note that, even though the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program is not legislatively mandated to work with the Department of Labor (DOL) on the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), we saw a great opportunity to help our programs work cooperatively for the benefit of our clients. We have incorporated TANF/WIA coordination and collaboration guidance in our outreach strategies; and we have reviewed WIA plans jointly with DOL. The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and DOL jointly developed a guide for improving the process of referring TANF clients from the State TANF agency to the Welfare-to-Work grantees. The Department has co-sponsored roundtables of State decision-makers to discuss strategies to create an integrated service delivery system between TANF/WIA for clients with barriers to employment. We sponsored an eight State meeting on how to bring together separate program funding streams, to create community-based service delivery to improve the self-sufficiency of low-income families. DHHS funded the study "Fixing to Change: A Best Practices Assessment of One-Stop Job Centers Working with Welfare Recipients." In short, DHHS views coordination in employment and training as vital to the success of our programs and our working relationship with DOL is strong.

This report correctly indicates that while several programs may serve the same general population, eligibility criteria often differ among specific programs. On page 5, it suggests that policymakers could "where appropriate, choose to integrate or consolidate programs or establish mechanisms to ensure program coordination." It is important to note that in many cases where there are "multiple" programs for the same general population, these programs have in fact been created by different congressional committees that have different overarching goals and that provide funding targeted to specific State, local or community agencies. While "providing assistance to individuals trying to find employment and/or improve their job skills" may be an

Now on page 5.

Appendix V
Comments From the Department of Health
and Human Services

Page 2

important program goal that is consistent across several programs, the "other" key program goals of each specific program often differ significantly.

As an example, the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) is a grant awarded to States, Territories, and Indian Tribes/Tribal organizations to provide a range of services and activities to assist low-income individuals and families to promote self-sufficiency, family stability and community revitalization. Employment and training are eligible activities under the CSBG Act. Funds are awarded to States; States then award these funds to local agencies that design programs to best meet the local needs. In many low-income communities, finding viable employment is an unmet need. Training is often lacking. Therefore CSBG funds are used to fill gaps in employment and training needs. We do not see the use of CSBG funds as an "overlap" or duplication in the area of employment and training programs; rather CSBG funds are sometimes used to expand employment and training services.

CSBG/Discretionary grants are awarded to non-profit organizations to support projects that provide employment and ownership opportunities for low-income individuals through employment skills development and business and commercial development. While the CSBG/Discretionary grant is not an employment and training program, some of the projects may have a training component. This is an acceptable use of these funds. We do not see this as duplication. This program is a job creation program. In fact, more jobs are needed in low-income communities so that welfare recipients can make the transition into self-sustaining employment.

It is also important to note that in many cases the Federal agency does not provide direct services. The Federal funds are sent to the State, Tribe, or local agency. States, Tribes, and local organizations often have tremendous flexibility in the design of their programs (e.g., TANF), and the Federal agencies have limited regulatory authority to require certain actions or define what results to expect from certain actions. We can "encourage and invite," but often we cannot mandate. We can showcase promising practices and model partnership at the Federal level, but the decision to implement remains with the grantee. We have devoted considerable resources to these efforts, but we agree that more work needs to be done. Given the lack of direct control over the content and structure of specific employment and training programs, it is problematic for performance plans to contain specific coordination goals regarding employment and training programs.

The report highlights the fact that WIA made great strides in formalizing coordination and cooperation among employment and training programs by creating one-stop employment centers with at least 12 programs offering their services in one place. We note that, although TANF is not a mandatory partner in the WIA one-stop centers, in many States TANF is included in the planning process at the State and local levels. CSBG programs are mandatory partners. On page 16, the report also points out that the primary goal of WIA is to integrate and streamline services and that "WIA generally provides for greater local control and closer coordination among employment and training programs than before the act was implemented." As noted, WIA was implemented only very recently, July 1, 2000. We believe that it is important to give this new approach to coordination of service delivery a chance to work.

Now on page 25.

Appendix V
Comments From the Department of Health
and Human Services

Page 3

We support efforts to streamline and avoid duplication; however, we are also aware that certain populations or individuals with unique or multiple issues have not been effectively served (or served at all) by broader-based programs. The Administration for Children and Families has identified "Reaching All Families" as one of the next steps in welfare reform. We believe effective partnerships are critical to attaining that goal.

EDITORIAL AND TECHNICAL COMMENTS:

Please note that Appendix II does not identify TANF, Refugee Assistance - Voluntary Agency Programs, Refugee and Entrant Assistance - Targeted Assistance and Tribal Work Grants as DHHS programs.

Comments From the Department of Housing and Urban Development



OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D.C. 20410-7000

September 6, 2000

Ms. Beth Morrison
GAO Senior Analyst
Education, Work Force, and Income Security
441 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Ms. Morrison:

We have reviewed the draft GAO audit report, no. GAO/HEHS-00-173, entitled "MULTIPLE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS, Overlap Among Programs Indicates Need for Closer Examination of Program Structure." We agree with the facts and opinions presented in the report, particularly as they relate to programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and have no comments for improvement and/or changes in the text.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,


William H. Eargle, Jr.
Comptroller

Comments From the Department of the Interior



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, D.C. 20240

SEP 15 2000

Ms. Cynthia M. Fagnoni
Director
Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Ms. Fagnoni:


Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the draft audit report entitled "MULTIPLE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS: Overlap Among Programs Indicates Need for Closer Examination of Program Structure (GAO/HEHS-00-173).

The audit concluded that coordination between Federal agencies is needed to ensure that the employment and training programs identified as part of the audit effectively meet their program goals and to avoid duplication. The Bureau of Indian Affairs implementation of the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-477) offers an example of such coordination. This initiative is not reflected in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance because there is no funding associated with the initiative. The Act authorizes tribes to combine funds received under individual programs into one comprehensive program. Some of the individual programs a tribe may choose to combine are those discussed in the draft audit report.

The enclosed information summarizes the Bureau's implementation of Public Law 102-477. Public Law 102-477, as the Bureau has implemented it, is considered by the Congress and tribes as a one-stop shop approach to employment and training. Recent Congressional hearings reflected the strong support for the initiative by all tribes testifying. More than 200 federally-recognized tribes are included in this initiative. Further portions of this initiative served as a model for the development of the Work Force Investment Act.

We firmly believe that a review of employment and training programs within the Bureau of Indian Affairs should address this initiative along with our individual programs. Ms. Lynn Forcia, Office of Economic Development, Bureau of Indian Affairs, is available to provide any additional information. She can be reached at (202) 219-5270.

Sincerely,


John Berry
Assistant Secretary
Policy, Management and Budget

Enclosure

Comments From the Department of Labor

U.S. Department of Labor

Assistant Secretary for
Veteran's Employment and Training
Washington, D.C. 20210



September 8, 2000

Ms. Cynthia M. Fagnoni
Director of Education, Workforce and Income Security Issues
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001

Dear Ms. Fagnoni:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft report on Multiple Employment and Training Programs; report HEHS-00173. Below are two substantive comments regarding the report:

Now on page 22.

1. Regarding page 14, paragraph 2: The Veterans' Employment and Training Service (VETS) is the agency responsible for providing employment and training services and assistance to our Nation's veterans. Targeted population programs are offered to veterans because of their special needs and other factors that separate the programs from the mainstream services offered. There are factors that must be considered when serving this population in comparison to other population groups. The veteran population can be found in all socioeconomic populations and include homeless, older workers, youth, disabled and dislocated workers. Many have skills that were acquired while on active duty in the military services. However, some of these individuals skills are more current than others, therefore requiring skills upgrade or retraining to accommodate industry changes or licensing and certification requirements. Many of these veterans require job placement assistance, since military service has been their first and only job - many of them have never had to apply for employment.

Now on page 27.
Now table 6.

2. Regarding page 18, first paragraph, and Table 6: VETS has five programs that focus on veterans: the Local Veterans' Employment Representative program, Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program (DVOP), Transition Assistance Program (TAP), Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Program (HVRP) and Veterans' Workforce Investment Program (VWIP) formerly Job Training Partnership Act, Title IV-C. These programs are intertwined and do not duplicate services, but enhance them, often in coordination with the Departments of Veterans' Affairs (VA) and Defense (DoD). DVOP staff give their highest priority to placing special disabled veterans that are about to graduate or have graduated from the VA's Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment program. They also provide placement assistance to participants in the HVRP and VWIP and work with service members that are about to separate (in partnership with DoD and the VA) in the Transition Assistance Program. These programs rely on memoranda of agreements with DoD, VA and HUD to minimize duplication of services and to ensure that veterans, who have historically been seen as a Federal rather than State responsibility, receive the best services possible. The emphasis of these programs is to maximize employment and training resources and staff and VETS is proud of its efforts to minimize any duplication of services or resources.

2

DVOP staff are out stationed at VA and DoD locations and facilitate Transition Assistance Program workshops, as well as working with HVRP and VWIP projects to provide employment assistance. GAO's own report (GAO/HEHS-98-7, VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING) addresses these linkages that were established to avoid duplication of services or resources.

We will be glad to clarify any of the above comments, if needed. Please call me at (202) 693-4700 if any clarification or further information is desired.

Sincerely,


Espiridon (Al) Borrego

Appendix VIII
Comments From the Department of Labor

U.S. Department of Labor

Assistant Secretary for
Employment and Training
Washington, D.C. 20210



SEP 8 2000

Ms. Cynthia M. Fagnoni
Director
Education, Workforce, and
Income Security Issues
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548

Dear Ms. Fagnoni:

Thank you for providing the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) the opportunity to comment on the draft General Accounting Office (GAO) report titled, Multiple Employment and Training Programs: Overlap Among Programs Indicates Need for Closer Examination of Program Structure. The following are ETA's comments:

We would like to point out that even when programs are not consolidated, they are integrated through the One-Stop delivery system at the local level. As the draft report states, WIA requires all states to establish One-Stop delivery systems designed to integrate service delivery at the local level. However, One-Stop did not begin with the enactment of WIA in 1998. During the 1990's all States received One-Stop implementation grants from the Department of Labor to begin establishing their coordinated systems. Since both Administration and Congressional leaders have endorsed this focus on coordination of program delivery through the One-Stop system, examining the number of programs may no longer be relevant in the area of education and training.

GAO should note Section 501 of WIA for unified program planning between the Department of Labor, HHS, and Education, USDA and HUD within WIA. The agencies issued unified planning guidance in January of 2000. Over 20 states have utilized this unified planning authority.

On pages 5 and 16, reference is made to the One-Stop system and its role in coordinating service delivery of federally-funded employment and training programs. We suggest that additional language be added in order to underscore the potential of the One-Stop system. The One-Stop system provides States and local communities with the opportunity to integrate a multitude of education and training programs at the "street-level," and to overcome many of the issues referenced in the draft report. For example, through the development of MOUs, local areas will analyze which programs offer which services, and will make

Now on pages 5-6 and 25.

2

resource allocations based on that information. As a result, if 10 of the One-Stop partner's programs previously provided job search assistance services, perhaps only 5 of them would need to provide such a service under the new system. The other 5 programs could allocate the funds previously used for job search assistance for other allowable activities that would benefit their customers and the community as a whole. Also, through the establishment of One-Stop systems, States and locals are developing administrative systems, such as common intake systems, that will promote program coordination.

Also, while 18 federal programs are required to be One-Stop partners under Title I of WIA, the Final Regulations at 20 CFR 662.210(c) clarify that the Governor has the authority to add additional partners to the system. Such partners may include TANF, Food Stamps, or any public or private program.

Many of the statements made on pages 5 and 16 refer to ineffective coordination and the lack of cross agency goals. The section does get to WIA on page 6, but a great deal of companion legislation is affected by the Act. This current legislation, while relatively new, holds promise for the promotion of coordinated effort. The report as currently drafted, has language that does not encompass the full range of reforms included in WIA. In fact, while Title I of the Act replaced JTPA, Title II of the Act reauthorized Adult Education, Title III of the Act contained amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act, and Title IV contained amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Each of these Titles contained language which required the programs to participate in and coordinate with the One-Stop service delivery system. In addition, the Perkins reauthorization bill, which was also enacted in 1998, contained coordination language.

The third sentence on page 7 should be rewritten to clarify that it is the WIA adult program that provides universal access to core services. Eligibility requirements apply to the youth and dislocated worker programs. The sentence should read, "Unlike the JTPA adult program, the WIA adult program imposes....."

The last sentence on page 7 implies that WIA did not consolidate enough because only two JTPA youth programs were consolidated. Enclosed is a matrix the Department developed during the WIA legislative process which lists the 51 DOL employment and training programs which were cited in the 1994 GAO report. Of these 51 programs, 20 were repealed by WIA; 17 were incorporated into WIA through the One-Stop system; 13 were linked to WIA, and only 1 (the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Project) had no relationship to WIA.

On page 14 second paragraph, the report seems to draw a parallel between youth programs and veterans programs as two programs of targeted assistance that provide similar services, (i.e. employment counseling, assessment, and job search/job placement assistance). The implication seems to be that this is evidence of duplicated effort. We do not agree with the suggestion that

Now on pages 6 and
26-27.

Now on page 7.

Now on page 7.

Now on pages 21-22.

Appendix VIII
Comments From the Department of Labor

3

these two disparate target populations should be served through one program with identical services. Congress specifically exempted Veterans. This is further discussed on page 15, where conclusions are drawn about duplication, specifically referencing the similarities between programs serving Native Americans, Youth, and Veterans.

Now on pages 29-30.

On Pages 18-19, the draft report discusses OMB's role in promoting program coordination. We suggest a paragraph be added that acknowledges the work that OMB has done working with the WIA Federal Partners group over the past year. On a monthly basis, OMB meets with the Assistant Secretaries from 9 Federal Agencies that are responsible for administering the One-Stop partner programs. Over the past year, the group has published unified planning guidance as well as a technical assistance guide on cost allocation and resource sharing. The group is also addressing such cross-cutting issues as performance accountability.

Now table 3.

Finally, on the charts, more explanation would be helpful regarding why the Workforce Investment Act was not included, including the time frame studied and the repeal of the Job Training Partnership Act. We found only one footnote to this effect. In general, having JTPA programs referenced in many of the charts is misleading since they do not acknowledge the WIA reforms. Using Table 4 as an example, an individual does not have to be economically disadvantaged to participate in the WIA adult or dislocated worker programs. Therefore, the inclusion of JTPA in this chart without an explanation, is misleading. Also, the eligibility criteria for the WIA adult and dislocated worker programs in Appendix III are not technically correct. Core services provided with dislocated worker funds are not universally accessible. An individual must meet the definition of "dislocated worker" to access services provided by those funds. Also, just because an individual is determined eligible for intensive services, they are not automatically eligible for training services under the adult and dislocated worker programs. The eligibility process is explained at 20 CFR 663.310.

Our technical comments have been transmitted to you under separate cover.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Jaime G. Salgado at (202) 219-5731 ext. 111.

Sincerely,

Raymond L. Bramucci
Raymond L. Bramucci

Enclosure

Comments From the Department of Veterans Affairs



THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
WASHINGTON

SEP 6 2000

Ms. Cynthia M. Fagnoni, Director
Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548

Dear Ms. Fagnoni:

We have reviewed your draft report **MULTIPLE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS: Overlap Among Programs Indicates Need For Closer Examination of Program Structure** (GAO/HEHS-00-173), and agree with the findings pertaining to the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment program (VR&E). The information contained in the draft report is consistent with the data we provided GAO in an earlier questionnaire.

VA continually works toward improving its VR&E program, which provides services and assistance necessary to enable veterans with service-connected disabilities and employment handicaps to become employable and obtain and maintain suitable employment. VR&E also enables veterans to achieve a level of independence in daily living while meeting their rehabilitation needs; and provides independent living services for severely disabled veterans who do not have employment potential.

I appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on your draft report.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Hershel W. Gober".

Hershel W. Gober
Acting

GAO Contacts and Staff Acknowledgments

GAO Contacts

Carol Dawn Petersen, (202) 512-7066
Elizabeth Morrison, (202) 512-9641

Staff Acknowledgments

In addition to the persons named above, the following persons made important contributions to this report. Suzanne Lofhjelm assisted in all aspects of the work throughout the review, Joan Vogel performed the analyses of data gathered from agency officials, James P. Wright provided guidance on study design and data analysis, and Jay G. Smale, Jr., provided survey support.

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report is free. Additional copies of reports are \$2 each. A check or money order should be made out to the Superintendent of Documents. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also.

Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Orders by mail:
U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 37050
Washington, DC 20013

Orders by visiting:
Room 1100
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC

Orders by phone:
(202) 512-6000
fax: (202) 512-6061
TDD (202) 512-2537

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

Orders by Internet:
For information on how to access GAO reports on the Internet, send an e-mail message with "info" in the body to:

info@www.gao.gov

or visit GAO's World Wide Web home page at:

<http://www.gao.gov>

To Report Fraud, Waste, or Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact one:


- Web site: <http://www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm>
- e-mail: fraudnet@gao.gov
- 1-800-424-5454 (automated answering system)

United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

Address Correction Requested

Bulk Rate
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. GI00



BEST COPY AVAILABLE